

Appl. No. 09/451,196

Statement of Substance of Interview Dated 08/31/2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application. No. : 09/451,196
Applicant : Radesh Manian
Filed : 11/29/1999
TC/A.U. : 2131
Examiner : Syed Zia

Confirmation No. 8729

Docket No. : 081862.P149
Customer No. : 8791

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:***FACSIMILE***☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.*
Tu Nguyen

Date

04/22/2004

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b)

Sir:

An Examiner's interview was conducted on August 3, 2004 between Examiner Syed Zia and Thinh Nguyen, Applicant's representative at the request of Applicant's representative.

An Interview Summary written by the Examiner was mailed on August 10, 2004.

The following is a summary of the Substance of Interview in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b) and MPEP 713.04.

(A) Brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted:

None.

(B) Identification of the claims discussed:

Independent claim 1 was discussed with references to independent claim 9, 17, and 25.

(C) Identification of the specific prior art:

The prior art reference discussed is the U.S. Patent No. 6,272,109 issued to Pei et al. ("Pei").

Docket No: 081862.P149

Page 1 of 3

TVN/m

Appl. No. 09/451,196

Statement of Substance of Interview Dated 08/31/2004

(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature:

The Interview Summary written by the Examiner dated August 10, 2004 covers the essence of the discussion. The Examiner suggested to amend the independent claims to add more limitations to define the elements better.

(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments:

Applicant's representative discussed the invention and pointed out the differences between the claimed invention and Pei. Specifically, Applicant's representative called the Examiner's attention to Figures 3A, 3B and 4 and explained the significance of the hardware schedule table and logical schedule table as opposed to the static and dynamic tables in Pei. Applicant's representative further discussed the significance of the delimiters and the unused entry and their relationship.

The Examiner indicated that the claim language does not clearly distinguish the claimed invention from Pei. The Examiner suggested that additional limitations and/or more relationships between the elements should be included. The Examiner suggested that limitations in dependent claims be considered where making amendments to the corresponding independent claims.

(F) General indication of any other pertinent matters:

The Examiner indicated that new arts may be cited if claims are amended. Accordingly, the Examiner suggested that claims should be amended to define the overall scope of the invention, such as to include language in the pre-amble that provides the context for the operation of dividing or creating the logical schedule tables.

(G) General results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate:

Although no agreement was reached regarding allowability, it was understood that amendments to the claims would be filed and the Examiner would consider the case.

(H) Interview via electronic mail:

Not applicable.

AUG. 31. 2004 5:13PM

BST&Z - CM

NO. 3156 P. 7

Appl. No. 09/451,196

Statement of Substance of Interview Dated 08/31/2004

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 31, 2004

By


Thinh V. Nguyen

Reg. No. 42,034

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025